

# Exhibit A

1                   THE COURT: Well, a monthly report for 58,000  
2 customers for additional years, you know, takes computer time  
3 to do that. I am not sure how much computer time.

4                   MR. ZEBRAK: Yeah.

5                   THE COURT: But, I mean, it generates a lot of  
6 information that then -- does that really bear any significant  
7 benefit to the parties in having what was -- you know, what  
8 this customer was billed in 2017 when you're talking about an  
9 infringement period that ended in 2014.

10                  MR. ZEBRAK: Yeah. I mean, I just think, you know,  
11 when a -- look, if a company terminates my account with them, I  
12 am less likely to probably sign up with them again.

13                  And the bottom line is, this is all revenue Cox  
14 wouldn't receive. It can make its arguments at trial, it can  
15 have its experts make its argument, but all this revenue -- I  
16 mean, what Cox wants to do is to say, look, this was a limited  
17 period of bad behavior at our company. And it wants to try and  
18 cabin everything into just this claim period.

19                  And it wants to, you know, just produce its -- again,  
20 its overall data and not allow us to focus on the moneys it  
21 received from these bad subscribers. And in the context of  
22 this case, running a report on just -- you know, revenues from  
23 these subscribers, really just isn't -- isn't that demanding.

24                  THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, I think I  
25 understand what the issues are there.

1                   I do think -- you know, I can appreciate the  
2 defendants' argument that they don't agree this information is  
3 relevant. And whether it makes its way into the trial of this  
4 case will be something for Judge O'Grady to decide. But I do  
5 think at this point in time it is discoverable information.

6                   And it is discoverable information that is available  
7 to Cox. The method that they maintain it, if it makes it  
8 difficult for them to gather that information, that still  
9 doesn't make it not relevant information.

10                  And the idea that it's going to cost \$15,000 doesn't  
11 overwhelm me, to be honest with you. Given the nature of this  
12 case and the amount that is being spent to litigate this case,  
13 that doesn't really impact me on the proportionality argument.  
14 That, you know, that kind of investment to get relevant  
15 information to produce in this case doesn't tip the scales.

16                  So I am going to require that revenue information  
17 attributable -- well, that billing information, yes,  
18 attributable to each subscriber for the time period from 2012  
19 through 2016. That gives you one year early during the period,  
20 a five-year period. I think that gives you at least a point  
21 for your experts to look at to see, to generate, you know -- I  
22 assume your experts are going to also then, you know, not only  
23 try to do what they have gotten to date, but what will be going  
24 in the future. And this is -- that's enough information for  
25 them to deal with.

1                   It needs to be done on a monthly basis. So that  
2 needs to be generated on a monthly basis. So it will be from  
3 -- a monthly basis from 2012 to 2016.

4                   I also want you to investigate and find out whether  
5 there is available information concerning the realization rates  
6 on billing information for that time period from 2012 through  
7 2016.

8                   So that, you know, we don't get into this, you know,  
9 that was only what was billed, it wasn't really what was  
10 received. That there can be some general correlation as to  
11 billing and actual receipts from the company since you've  
12 indicated or represented to the Court that the revenue  
13 information is much more difficult to obtain. Okay.

14                  All right, issue 2. You need to help me understand  
15 what it is really is you're asking for on this. Because, you  
16 know, if we're talking about every communication dealing with  
17 every infringement, that's not going to win any argument.

18                  MR. ZEBRAK: Yes, sir.

19                  THE COURT: And so, I mean, it's a little unclear to  
20 me -- and, you know, it's difficult to order something that's  
21 unclear because I don't want to put the other side in a  
22 position of coming back and not knowing what it is I'm  
23 requiring them to do. So that you come back and say, they  
24 didn't do what you told them to do, and we have to come back in  
25 and say, I interpreted it as this, I interpreted it as that.